



BATTLE ROAD STRUCTURE SURVEY PHASE II

(Phase I included as Appendix)

Minute Man National Historical Park
Concord, Massachusetts



Historic Architecture Program
Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation
October 2005

Minute Man National Historical Park Battle Road Structure Survey

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Use Types with Associated Uses for Historic Structures and Associated Landscapes.....	4
Impact Assessment per Structure and Landscape.....	6
<u>Specific Sites:</u>	
John Nelson House, Barn and Landscape.....	7
Farwell Jones House, James Carty Barn and Landscape.....	17
McHugh Barn and Landscape.....	27
Major John Buttrick House and Landscape.....	32
Noah Brooks Tavern, Rogers Barn and Landscape.....	38
Stow- Hardy House, Hovagimian Garage and Landscape.....	46
Joshua Brooks Jr. House and Landscape.....	50
George Hall House and Landscape.....	54
Gowing- Clarke House and Landscape.....	59
Samuel Brooks House and Landscape.....	62
Appendix (Phase I Report).....	65
Bibliography.....	92

Introduction

Purpose of Project

The Minute Man National Historical Park Battle Road Structure Survey project was completed in two phases. Phase I, completed in October 2004, determined an impact assessment for the 14 structures and 10 sites included in the project. The summary of the Impact Assessment of phase I is included on page 6 of this report. Phase II of this project utilized the findings from phase I as a guide in formulating new use alternatives for each structure and site.

Minute Man National Historical Park has identified the 14 structures and 10 sites that are eligible for reuse in accordance with the statement outlined in *NPS- 28: Cultural Resource Management Guideline, Chapter 3: Planning*:

“The goal of cultural resource planning in the national park system is to identify and preserve park cultural resources and to provide for their appreciation by the public. It strives to integrate cultural resource concerns into broader NPS planning processes, to avoid or minimize harm to cultural resources, to identify the most appropriate uses for cultural resources...”¹

Throughout this project’s planning process the park has understood the challenge of balancing the overall interpretation of the park with simultaneously finding new uses for these sites that are desirable to the surrounding community. As new uses alternatives were brainstormed, the mission of the park was clearly kept on the forefront. Minute Man National Historical Park’s mission as stated in the National Register Nomination for the park is as follows:

“The primary mission of the park has been to approximate the cultural environment that existed in 1775 and preserve and interpret individual resources that contribute to understanding the events of the Battle of Lexington and Concord. As part of that mission, the NPS has removed more than 200 nineteenth and twentieth century buildings and structures in an attempt to recreate the open, agricultural appearance that the area had at the time of the battle.”²

¹ Department of Interior. National Park Service. *Director’s Order 28: Cultural Resource Management Guideline, Chapter 3, p.1*. 1998.

² Mary Kate Harrington, Emily Paulus, Duncan Ritchie, Stephen Olausen, *National Register Nomination, Minuteman National Historical Park, Section 7, p.1*, November 2002.

Definition of Objectives

The goal of phase II, as mentioned previously, was to use the findings from phase I and generate a list of alternative new uses for each site within the project scope. The objective during this process was to create this list of new uses in collaboration with the park as well as professionals from a variety of disciplines. Input from the park was invaluable to this process because of the intimate familiarity they possess not only of their cultural resources, but also the day-to-day activities that they experience within the park.

A variety of different disciplines was also consulted during round table meetings with the park. This included a senior asset reviewer from CoBank located in Springfield, MA; members from Community Action Partners (CAP) organized by the Harvard Business School Association of Boston; and members from The Farm School located in Athol, MA. All landscape assessments for each site were completed by the Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation. Collaboration from the Olmsted Center was fundamental to the outcome of this project.

Data Collection and Analysis

Phase I of this project involved a methodology that evaluated both the structures and the landscapes that allowed for the greatest amount of information per site to be considered to inform the final impact assessment. Several documents were utilized in the determination of significance; the primary documents referenced were the park's National Register Nomination and available historic structure reports. Once the determination of significance was established, architectural and historical integrity could be assessed. The primary guide utilized in the assessment of integrity was *The National Register Bulletin 15: How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Property*. A walk-through of each structure and landscape was preformed evaluating each of these seven aspects of integrity in situ. The final product resulted in a matrix that simultaneously outlined each structure's and site's significance and integrity, which when added together generated the impact assessment.

Development and Evaluation of New Use Alternatives

Phase II of this project began with a round table meeting with the park that resulted in a proposed list of new uses. After the meeting, the list of proposed new uses was organized in "use type" categories to suggest that if one use was proposed for a site, then perhaps another use within the same "use type" category should also be considered. The next step was to match the new uses generated from the first brainstorming meeting to specific properties. A matrix was prepared outlining the new use alternatives for each site. Pros and cons that each proposed new use would yield on the structures and landscapes were entered into the matrix. Among several issues taken in account, some specific matters

considered were if the new use would add to or detract from the mission of the park; how great an impact would the new use have on both the structure and landscape; how the new use would capture or impede pedestrian flow; if the new use would attract more visitors to the park; how extensive a configuration or rehabilitation of the structure would be required; if the new use would require additional septic utilities; and if the new use would require additional parking. A second meeting was held to receive feedback from the park. The purpose of this meeting was to present to the park the draft findings and to weed out those uses that were not favorable. What resulted from this meeting was a short list of proposed new uses for each structure and site as well as the formation of these proposed new uses into a hierarchy of: Preferred Uses, Less Preferred Uses, and Non- Preferred Uses.

Issues

Several issues were identified throughout the project that reoccurred amongst each site. Septic issues were at the top of the list and were identified as being outside the scope of this project. This issue will need to be explored further with greater expertise in the subject area. Several sites had several alternative uses in common, specifically in the area surrounding the Brooks' properties as well as the Farwell Jones and Stow- Hardy site. An idea surfaced to treat these properties that have common proposed uses and that are close in proximity to one another as clustered or compounded properties. For example, if the Noah Brook Tavern site is used as a tavern on the first floor and an inn on the second floor, the Joshua Brooks Jr. site could also be used as an inn under the same commercial venture as the Noah Brooks Tavern site.

Parking was also seen as a challenge. However, the Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation was very adept regarding this issue and compiled a parking feasibility study that has been included throughout this report. Several other issues were also confronted such as technology needs and building code upgrades; these issues were also believed to be outside the scope of this project and should be addressed in the later planning stages of each site.

The report included herein includes the list of proposed new uses; the Impact Assessment from phase I; and the matrix that includes proposed uses for each structure and landscape and the respective pros and cons.

Use Types with Associated Uses for Historic Structures and Associated Landscapes:

Educational:

National Academy of 18th C. Life
Educational Center (School Groups)
Kids Camp (Nature or Colonial)
Environmental Educational Center (w/Partner like AMC)
Farm School (Farm and Children Education Mission)

Retail:

General Store
Gallery
Agricultural Sale Outlet (Farm Stand)

Recreational:

Outdoor Sport Rental Facility (Bikes, Snowshoes, etc.)
Recreational Center
Horseback Riding/Recreational Horses
Golf Course

Agricultural:

U- Pick Farm
Grazing
Sheep Shearing
Community Farm (Plots for Rent)
Cider Mill
Grist Mill
Forest- Related Venue (Follow Wood Production)
Animals
Artisan Cheeses/Cheese Making
Cows/Dairy

Gathering Space/Entertainment:

Conference Center
Functions
Theatre
Dances
18th C. House of Horrors
Cooking Classes

Food Concession/Restaurants:

Tavern

Artisan Cheeses

Restaurant – 18th C. Traditional Cooking

Visitor Food Concessions (Theme Orientated)/ Dairy Concessions

Tea Room

Residential:

Artist Residence

Elder Hostel

Youth Hostel

Park Housing

Bed and Breakfast/Inn

Seasonal Housing

Farmer Residence

Artisan Crafts:

Tinsmithing

Glassblowing

Candlestick Making

Furniture Making

Artisan Cheeses/Cheese Making

Interpretive:

19th C. Tourism/Interpretive

Interpretive Story

Building as an Exhibit

Annual Herding of Animals

Living History/Working Farm

Archeology – Public Access

Exhibit Space

Miscellaneous:

Non- Profit Lease

Residential Resource Partners

Curatorial Storage

Park Use

Leased Office Space (profit/non- profit)

Park Office Space

Impact Assessment

Mean Impact Rating per Structure

High Impact Level	12	Joshua Brooks Jr. House
	13	George Hall House
	14	Gowing- Clarke House
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	Stow- Hardy Garage, Noah Brooks Tavern
Medium Impact Level	19	John Nelson Barn, Stow- Hardy House,
	20	Rogers Barn, McHugh Barn, James Carty Barn
	21	
	22	
	23	Samuel Brooks House
	24	
	25	
	26	
	27	Farwell Jones House, John Nelson House
Low Impact Level	28	Major John Buttrick House

Mean Impact Rating per Landscape

High Impact Level	14	Stow- Hardy Site, Joshua Brooks Jr. Site
	15	George Hall Site, Gowing- Clarke Site
	16	John Nelson Site
Medium Impact Level	17	
	18	Farwell Jones Site, Samuel Brooks Site, Major John Buttrick Site
	19	Noah Brooks Site
	20	
Low Impact Level	21	McHugh Site

John Nelson House, Barn, Landscape



Current Use

House: Residential (Hanscom Residential Lease).

Barn: Vacant / NPS Light Storage.

Impact

Structure: Low Impact Level (27 out of a possible 36 points).

Barn: Medium Impact Level (19 out of a possible 36 points).

Landscape: Medium to High Impact Level (16 out of a possible 24 points).

Issues

Parking:

Existing: 2 spaces.

Potential: 3 extra spaces against the barn and 2 spaces facing the main road 2A.

Total: 7 spaces.

Other: Not recommended for visitor parking due to limited space to maneuver a car. Driveway should remain unpaved. Minor improvement to driveway and entrance will be necessary in addition to construction of a new parking area. Several large trees (acer and quercus) should be protected. Parking at Visitor Center may be an option as well.

Septic:

Existing: New septic installed in 2003 for residential use (5 bedrooms).

Required: See attached septic information (will vary according to use).

Other

- House constructed ca. 1808 – 1810, barn constructed ca. 1810 – 1824.
- Possibility of some part of the house being a witness structure – to confirm this, more architectural investigation and a full historic structure report would be required.
- Consider cluster arrangement with Whittemore Educational Center and Visitor Center located nearby. Location is close to trail.

John Nelson Site	House (Low Impact Level)		Barn (Medium Impact Level)		Landscape (Medium Impact Level)	
	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
	Preferred Uses	Combined Use				
House: Building as an Exhibit Barn: See Educational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unique interpretive experience for park visitors - would be one of a kind display in the park. - Would capture people from the trail and from the Visitor Center parking lot. - Would contribute to the local significance in architecture. - Could supplement exhibit with museum objects relating to the field of architecture. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would require a full Historic Structure Report to understand structure before this could be accomplished. - Could potentially have high impact on structure through the peeling back of “layers” and creation of an exhibit. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not require additional septic. - Close in proximity to Visitor Center parking lot. - Would have low impact on landscape. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visitor Center parking lot may be too far removed (unless a shorter path to house was constructed.) 	
- Additional Alternative-Barn: See Artisan Crafts						
House: Artists in Residence Barn: Gallery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would be compatible use if Barn is used for Artisans Crafts or Gallery. - Use would be consistent with historic function of the structure as a residence. - Minimal to no 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not have appropriate space for a studio. - Would not contribute to park mission. - Would remove structure from public use and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compatible use if house is used for an artist’s residence. - Existing floor plan would not have to be greatly altered - would have low impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not generate enough interest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not require additional septic. - Close in proximity to Visitor Center parking lot. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visitor Center parking lot may be too far removed (unless a shorter path to house was constructed.)

<p>- <i>Additional Alternative - Barn:</i> See Agriculture</p> <p>- <i>Additional Alternative- Barn:</i> See Artisan Crafts</p>	conversion cost. - Low impact on structure.	enjoyment.				
<p>Educational Barn: Educational Center (School Groups / National Academy for 18th C. Life)</p>	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
			<p>- Space is large enough to be a large classroom / auditorium to be used for lectures.</p> <p>- Would contribute to park's mission through education of children and public on 18th C. history, etc.</p> <p>- Minimal conversion cost – low impact on structure.</p> <p>- Consider cluster arrangement with Whittemore Educational Center and the Visitor Center.</p>		<p>- Transportation could be provided by buses that could park at Visitor Center parking lot.</p>	<p>- Would require additional septic.</p> <p>- Would have medium impact on landscape.</p> <p>- Visitor Center parking lot may be too far removed (unless a shorter path to house was constructed.)</p>

Less Preferred Uses							
Combined Use	House and Barn: Youth Hostel	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Floor plan may not need to be greatly altered. - Great alternative hostel housing in the city of Boston – less expensive and more space. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May introduce excessive wear and tear on historic structure due to transient nature – could have high impact. - Could require extensive building code upgrade (ADA, Fire Safety). - House may be too small for this use. - Would not contribute to park mission. - Not easily accessible via public transportation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Large amount of space could accommodate a large number of rooms. - Great alternative hostel housing in the city of Boston – less expensive and more space. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost of conversion would be high. - Would have high impact on structure. - Could require extensive building code upgrade (ADA, Fire Safety). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of Visitor Center parking lot may be an option for a youth hostel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May require additional septic depending on number of occupants. - Visitor Center parking lot may be too far removed (unless a shorter path to house was constructed.)
Recreational	Barn: Outdoor Sport Rental Facility	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would capture people staying at the Inn. - Would capture people from the trail. - Could be a good source of income. - Existing floor plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not contribute to the park mission. - May not generate enough interest. - Space may be too large for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would encourage exploration of surrounding landscape and add to the visitor experience. - No additional septic would be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Added exploration of surrounding area could cause a high impact to the landscape. - Visitor Center parking lot may be too far

			would not have to be greatly altered and the impact would be low.	this use.	required. - Close in proximity to Visitor Center parking lot.	removed (unless a shorter path to house was constructed.)
Agricultural	Pro	Con	Pro - Would continue the agricultural scene of park. - Minimal conversion required - Low impact to structure.	Con - Could potentially be limited to seasonal operation. - Space may be too large for this new use.	Pro - No additional septic would be required. - Close in proximity to Visitor Center parking lot.	Con
Barn: Agricultural Sale Outlet						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visitor Center parking lot may be too far removed (unless a shorter path to house was constructed.) - Medium impact to site.
Other	Pro	Con	Pro - Would capture people from the trail and perhaps from the Visitor Center parking lot. - Desirable for visitors – may increase visitation to park. - May be economically profitable – admission charge. - Compatible use with floor space / historic function of structure – would have low impact.	Con - Could have difficulty in finding artisan craftsmen.	Pro - Additional parking may not be required due to the proximity of the Visitor Center parking lot.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May require additional septic. - Visitor Center parking lot may be too far removed (unless a shorter path to house was constructed.) - Would have medium impact to landscape.
Barn: Artisan Crafts (Glassblowing, Tinsmithing, Furniture Making, Candlestick Making, Cheese making)						

				- Would contribute to the park's mission through historic craft demonstrations.			
Non- Preferred Uses							
Combined Use	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Con
House: Tea Room Barn: See Recreational	- Would be only food concession between Rt. 128 and downtown Concord. - Would capture people from the trail. - Would contribute to the historic scene of park.	- Would need to expand kitchen – may have high impact on structure. - Would not be consistent with historic function of structure.			- Close in proximity to Visitor Center parking lot.	- May require additional septic depending the umber of seated occupancy. - Visitor Center parking lot may be too far removed (unless a shorter path to house was constructed.)	
- <i>Additional Alternative-</i> Barn: See Agriculture							
- <i>Additional Alternative-</i> Barn: See Artisan Crafts							
House: Director's Residence Barn:	- Use would be consistent with historic function of the structure as a residence.	- Would not contribute to park mission. - Would remove		- Cost of conversion would be high - high impact to	- House would not require additional septic. - Close in	- Barn would require additional septic. - Visitor Center	

Conference Center	- Minimal to no conversion cost. - Low impact on structure.	structure from public use and enjoyment.	structure.	proximity to Visitor Center parking lot.	parking lot may be too far removed (unless a shorter path to house was constructed.)
House: Office (Profit / Non-profit) Barn: See Recreational	- Potentially good, reliable economic income.	- Office space requirements such as IT needs and heavy equipment might cause a high impact on structure. - Would not contribute to park mission. - Would not be consistent with historic function of structure. - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment.		- Depending of number of occupants, may have adequate parking and septic. - Would have low impact on landscape.	
- Additional Alternative-Barn: See Educational					
House and Barn: Bed and Breakfast/Inn	- Desirable location, not many lodging choices in area. - Lodging in area would promote visitation and use of the park.	- Structure may be too small for this use. - May introduce excessive wear and tear on historic	- Desirable location, not many lodging choices in area. - Good compatible use with house as a Bed and Breakfast	- Cost of conversion would be high - could have high impact on structure.	- Potential parking of 7 spaces may be sufficient. - Close in proximity to Visitor Center
					- May require additional septic (additional bathrooms - one per bedroom). - Would have

		structure due to transient nature. - Would not contribute to park mission. - Additional bathrooms (one per bedroom) would need to be added to structure – could have high impact on structure. - Could require extensive building code upgrade (ADA, Fire Safety).	as well.	- Would not contribute to park mission.	parking lot.	medium impact on landscape. - Visitor Center parking lot may be too far removed (unless a shorter path to house was constructed.)
- <i>Additional Alternative-Barn:</i> See Recreational						
- <i>Additional Alternative-Barn:</i> See Agriculture						
- <i>Additional Alternative-Barn:</i> See Artisan Crafts						
Educational	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
House and Barn: Environmental	- Compatible use for park – contributes to	- Would not directly contribute	- Existing floor plan would be good for		- Great compatible use for landscape	- Visitor Center parking lot may

Education Center– Staging Area Only	management of natural resources. - Great setting for use – close to trail. - Existing floor space would lend itself well to small presentation/exhibit spaces. - Transportation could be provided by buses.	to park’s mission. - Would not be consistent with historic function of structure.	presentations or large classroom space.		and natural resources – impact would be low. - May not require additional septic. - Close in proximity to Visitor Center parking lot.	be too far removed (unless a shorter path to house was constructed.)
Agricultural	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Barn: Animals			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would be a use that is consistent with the historic function of the structure. - Would not require a great alteration in floor plan of existing structure and therefore would have a low impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would require staffing to tend after/care for animals. - Not highly profitable. - Site is not necessarily a “destination site” and animals may not be highly visited/seen. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would be in keeping with the historic and agricultural scene. - No additional parking would be required. - No additional septic would be required. - Low impact on landscape. 	
Barn: Living History / Working Farm			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would contribute to the agricultural significance of park / agrarian tradition. - Could be economically profitable (admission charge). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would require a large number of staff. - Difficulty in finding this “highly specialized” staff. - Would be a seasonal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Close in proximity to Visitor Center parking lot. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landscape may not be large enough for this sort of operation. - Visitor Center parking lot may be too far removed (unless a shorter path to house was

				operation only.		constructed.) - Additional septic would be required. - Would have high impact.
--	--	--	--	-----------------	--	--

Farwell Jones House, James Carty Barn, and Landscape



Current Use

House: Residential (Private lease).

Barn: Vacant / NPS Light Storage.

Impact

Structure: Low Impact Level (27 out of 36 possible points).

Barn: Medium Impact Level (20 of 36 possible points).

Landscape: Medium Impact Level (18 out of 24 possible points).

Issues:

Parking:

Existing: 3 spaces available around the house and possibly 3 spaces next to the utility shed. Parking area is paved, but in poor condition.

Potential: 5- 7 spaces could be made around the house and in front of the barn and silo. Additional 6- 12 spaces could be located behind the barn, next to the utility shed(s).

Total: 22 spaces.

Other: This site needs particular attention due to the proximity if the Battle Road and views. One way to deal with such a challenge is to break up the parking into several “micro” lots.

Septic:

Existing: House has septic for residential use; barn has septic.

Required: See attached septic information (will vary according to use).

Other

- Most intact agricultural site in project.
- Witness structure - house constructed ca. 1700 – 1716, barn constructed in 1903.

Farwell Jones Site	House (Low Impact Level)		Barn (Medium Impact Level)		Landscape (Medium Impact Level)	
Preferred Uses	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
House: Artist Residence (multiple Artists or Artist and family) Barn: Gallery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would be compatible use if Barn is used for Artisan Crafts or Gallery. - Minimal conversion cost. - Compatible use with floor space/historic function of structure. - Low impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not have appropriate room for studio space. - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good match for artist residence. - Compatible use with existing floor space of structure and therefore would have a low impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not generate enough interest. - Would not continue agrarian tradition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not require additional parking. - Would not require additional septic needs. - Very low impact on landscape. - Land could be farmed/used by Stow- Hardy resident. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not continue agrarian tradition.
<i>- Additional Alternative-</i> Barn: Artisan Crafts (Glassblowing, Tinsmithing, Furniture Making, Candlestick Making, Cheese making)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desirable for visitors, may increase visitation to Park. - May be economically profitable – admission charge. - Compatible use with floor space/historic function of structure. - Would have low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could have difficulty in finding artisan craftsmen. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not require additional septic needs. - May have adequate parking (potential). - Would have low impact on landscape. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not continue agrarian tradition.

House and Barn: Bed & Breakfast/Inn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desirable location, not many lodging choices in area. - Compatible with Barn for use as a Bed & Breakfast/Inn as well. - Lodging in area would promote the use of the Park and increase visitation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May introduce excessive wear and tear on historic structure due to transient nature. - Additional bathrooms would need to be added to structure (1 bathroom per bedroom). - Would have medium impact to structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desirable location, not many lodging choices in area. - Great compatible use with house as Bed & Breakfast/Inn as well. - Lodging in area would promote the use of the Park and increase visitation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost of conversion would be high. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May have adequate parking (potential). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not continue agrarian tradition. - Adequate septic would need to be installed. - Could have medium impact on landscape.
House: Director's Residence/Office Barn: Theatre/Dances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compatible with historic function of structure as a residence. - Minimal conversion cost. - Impact to structure would be low. - Garage behind house could be used for ticket sales or bathroom. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission. - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would require the use of only one floor, allowing the other floors to be multiuse - 1st Floor: Equipment Storage, 2nd Floor: Dance/Theatre, 3rd Floor: Misc. - Cost of conversion would be minimal. - Impact to structure would be low. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not continue agrarian tradition. - May not have adequate parking (potential). - Adequate septic for barn would need to be installed. - May have high impact on landscape (parking and septic needs).
House: Director's Residence/Office Barn: Conference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compatible with historic function of structure as a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not continue agrarian tradition or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would require the use of only one floor, allowing the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not continue agrarian tradition or 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not continue agrarian tradition.

Center	<p>residence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimal conversion cost. - Impact to structure would be low. - Garage behind house could be used for ticket sales or bathroom. 	<p>contribute to park's mission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment. 	<p>other floors to be multiuse - 1st Floor: Equipment storage, 2nd Floor: Conference Space, 3rd Floor: Misc.</p>	<p>contribute to park's mission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost of conversion would be high and impact level would be high. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not have adequate parking (potential). - Adequate septic for barn would need to be installed. - Impact level to landscape would be high.
<p>House and Barn: Office Space (lease)</p> <hr/> <p>- <i>Additional Alternative-</i> Barn: See Agriculture</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potentially good, reliable economic income. - Floor space would not need to be altered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requirements for office (IT needs and heavy office equipment) use may be intrusive/ too great an impact to historic structure. - Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission. - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission. - Cost of conversion would be high. - Impact level to structure would be high. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission. - Adequate septic for barn would need to be installed. - Could have medium impact to landscape.
<p>House : Farm School Barn: See Artisan Crafts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to park's mission. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to park's mission. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential to tie into the park's interpretive program. - Could store farm equipment in the Hovagimian Garage. 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not require additional septic. - May have adequate parking (potential). - Low impact on landscape. 	
House and Barn: Elder/Youth Hostel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compatible use with floor space/historic function of structure. - Floor plan would not need to be greatly altered. - Great alternative hostel housing in the city of Boston – less expensive and more space. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could require extensive building code upgrade (ADA, Fire Safety). - House may be too small for this use. - Transient nature of use may have high impact on structure. - Would not contribute to park mission. - Not easily accessible via public transportation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Large square footage of space could accommodate a large number of people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could require extensive building code upgrade (ADA, Fire Safety) as well as extensive alteration of the existing floor plan. - Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park mission. - Transient nature of use may have high impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May have adequate parking (potential). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not continue agrarian tradition. - Adequate septic would need to be installed. - Would have medium impact on landscape.
- <i>Additional Alternative-</i> Barn: See Agriculture						
Agricultural	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
House and Barn: Living History / Working Farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could combine with Farm School? - Cold potentially 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would require a large number of staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would require a large number of staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to 	

	<p>increase visitation to park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use is consistent with historic function of structure. - Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to park's mission. - Would have low impact. 	<p>- Would be an only seasonal operation.</p>	<p>park's mission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could potentially increase visitation to Park. - Use is consistent with historic function of structure. - Would have low impact. 	<p>- Difficulty in finding this "highly specialized" staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would be a seasonal operation only. 	<p>park's mission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not require additional septic. - Could potentially increase visitation to Park. - Highly intact agricultural site would lend itself well to this use. - Parking may be adequate (potential). - Would have low impact on landscape. 	
<p>Barn: U- Pick, Sheep Shearing, Cows:</p>			<p>- Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to park's mission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could potentially increase visitation to park. - Very low impact to structure. 	<p>- Could potentially be limited to seasonal profitability (U-Pick).</p>	<p>- Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to park's mission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - U- Pick option requires less staff to farm the land. - Could potentially increase visitation to the Park. - No additional septic would be required. - May have adequate parking 	<p>- Could potentially be limited to seasonal profitability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Soil may not be suitable for growing crops.

						(potential). - Very low impact to landscape.	
Barn: Agricultural Sale Outlet				- Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to park's mission. - Minimal conversion would be required. - Low impact to structure.	- Could potentially be limited to seasonal profitability.	- Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to park's mission. - No additional septic would be required. - May have adequate parking (potential). - Low impact.	
Barn: Community Farm				- Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to park's mission. - Large amount of space would allow this use to be combined with another use. - Would have a low impact on structure.	- Use may require some indoor space but this space would be too large to be utilized for this alone.	- Would continue agrarian tradition. - Land is worked by community, nominal labor costs. - Involves local community with Park. - Would require less heavy machinery to maintain land. - No additional septic would be required. - May have adequate parking.	- Would need a lot of local interest in order for this use to be successful. - Soil may not be suitable for growing crops.

<p>House: Seasonal Housing Barn: See Agriculture</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compatible use with floor space/historic function of structure. - Good compatibility for the Park. - Added attraction to increase applicants for seasonal employment. - Minimal conversion cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission. - May not be economically feasible for the park. - May introduce extra wear and tear as a result of transient housing. - Transient nature may cause medium impact on structure. - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No additional septic needs would be required. - No additional parking would be required. - Low impact on landscape. 	
<p>Recreational Landscape: Golf Course</p>	<p>Pro</p>	<p>Con</p>	<p>Pro</p>	<p>Con</p>	<p>Pro</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could use the Stow- Hardy House as support structure (Club House). - Large amount of land makes this use feasible. - Could have adequate potential parking. 	<p>Con</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not continue agrarian tradition or the park's mission (most agriculturally intact site in project). - Could be disruptive to rest of the park. - High impact.

Non- Preferred Uses							
Agricultural		Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Barn: Cider Mill/Grist Mill				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to park's mission. - Could involve retail of product. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grist Mill not historically accurate (historically no hydropower on site?) - Cost of conversion would be high and appropriate equipment would be high. - High impact to structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No additional septic would be required. - May have adequate parking (potential). - Low impact to site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For cider mill, would need to grow apples on site and soil may not be suitable for this.

McHugh Barn and Landscape



Current Use: Vacant.

Impact

Barn: Medium Impact Level (20 out of a possible 36 points).

Landscape: Medium to Low Impact Level (21 out of a possible 24 points).

Issues

Parking:

Existing: None.

Potential: Adjacent lot east of Barn may be available for intermittent parking (perhaps after- park hours).

Total: See other.

Other: Nearest parking is approximately 700 ft. away in Visitor Center parking lot (35 spaces, 2 spaces for buses).

Septic:

Existing: None.

Required: See attached septic information (will vary according to use).

Other

- Barn constructed in 1939.
- Barn has two floors and each can be used for a separate use. First floor appears to be more of a public- orientated space, while the Lower Level would be more suitable for animals or storage.
- NPS Comfort Station located 700 ft. from site.
- New use should not interrupt Hartwell Tavern operation.

McHugh Barn Site	Barn (Medium Impact Level)		Landscape (Medium to Low Impact Level)	
	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Preferred Uses Gathering Spaces / Entertainment Theatre/Dances	- Would not require a great alteration of the existing floor plan of structure and therefore would have a low impact.	- Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission.	- Parking available in Visitor Parking lot. - Could use park's Comfort Station located approximately 700 ft. from the site.	- Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission. - Adequate septic for barn would need to be installed if comfort station is considered too far removed. - Medium impact on landscape (if septic installed).
Interpretive Exhibit Space (Upper Level)	- Would contribute to park's mission. - Would not require a great alteration of the existing floor plan of structure and therefore would have a low impact. - Could combine with animals on lower level.	- Would not continue agrarian tradition or be consistent with historic function of the structure.	- Parking available in Visitor Parking lot. - Could use park's Comfort Station located approximately 700 ft. from the site. - Low impact to landscape.	
Agricultural Animals: Grazing or Sheep Shearing	- Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to park's mission. - Would be a use that is consistent with the historic	- Would require additional staffing to tend after/care for animals. - Not economically profitable.	- Would be in keeping with the historic and agricultural scene. - No additional parking would be required.	

	<p>function of the structure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not require a great alteration in floor plan of existing structure. - Could occupy lower level of barn only allowing a separate use for upper level. - Would have a low impact. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No additional septic would be required. - Low impact on landscape. 	
Artisan Crafts	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	
Artisan Crafts (Glassblowing, Tinsmithing, Furniture Making, Candlestick Making, Cheese making)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to park's mission. - Desirable for visitors, may increase visitation to park. - May be economically profitable – admission charge. - Would not require a great alteration in floor plan of existing structure. - Would have a low impact. - Could share this space and have animals on the lower level. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to park's mission. - No additional parking would be required. - No additional septic would be required (proximity of Comfort Station). - Very low impact on landscape. 		
Less Preferred Uses					
Gathering Spaces / Entertainment	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	
Conference Center	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could be used all year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission. - Cost of conversion would be high and therefore use would have a high impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking available in Visitor Parking lot. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission. - Adequate septic for barn would need to be installed. - Medium impact on 	

			- May not be a compatible use with Hartwell Tavern in close proximity.		landscape.
Educational		Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Kids Day Camp (Nature or Colonial)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Would continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission.- Cost of conversion would be minimal.- Would not require a great alteration in floor plan of existing structure.- Would low impact.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Noise level might be highly interruptive to Hartwell Tavern operations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- No additional parking would be required (drop off and pick up at Visitor Center parking lot).- No additional septic would be required (proximity of Comfort Station).- Would have low impact on landscape.- Some camp activities may contribute positively to the landscape.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Camp activities may promote excessive wear and tear on landscape.
Food Concession / Restaurant		Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Food Concessions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Would capture people from Hartwell Tavern and the Battle Road Trail.- Could have “portable concessions” or vending machines.- Could be a seasonal operation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Nature orientated setting not optimal for retail.- Would not continue agrarian tradition or be consistent with historic function of the structure.- Could potentially require a lot of alteration to existing structure and therefore a high impact.- Parking at the Visitor Center parking lot would be difficult for handicap accessibility to structure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- No additional parking would be required.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Food concession may promote lingering and therefore excess wear and tear on landscape.- Additional septic would be required.- Would increase the amount of litter on landscape (park’s carry-in/carry- out and no trash can policy).- Would have high impact on landscape.

Recreational	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Outdoor Sport Rental Facility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to park's mission. - Would capture people from Hartwell Tavern and the Battle Road Trail. - Would require little alteration to existing structure and therefore little impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nature of use might congest trail. - Might be interruptive to Hartwell Tavern operation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No additional parking would be required. - No additional septic would be required (proximity of Comfort Station). - Would encourage exploration of surrounding landscape and add to the visitor experience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Activity could be destructive to surrounding area and cause high impact on landscape.
Other	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Curatorial Storage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would contribute to park's mission. - Adequate amount of space available. - No alteration of floor plan. - Low impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would remove this structure from public use and enjoyment. - Costs of climate control mechanism may be expensive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No parking would be required. - No septic would be required. - Low impact on landscape. 	

Major John Buttrick House and Landscape



Current Use: Residential and Occasional Park Meeting Space.

Impact

House: Low Impact Level (28 out of a possible 36 points).

Landscape: Medium Impact Level (18 out of a possible 24 points).

Issues

Parking:

Existing: 3 spaces.

Potential: Current driveway is not recommended for expansion.

Total: 3 spaces on premises plus Visitor Center parking lot.

Other: Visitor Center parking lot directly across the street.

Septic:

Existing: Current septic installed adequate for residential use.

Required: See attached septic information (will vary according to use).

Other

- Witness structure - house constructed in 1715 (major alterations done in 1930s.)
- Use for Park would be good considering the proximity to Park Headquarters.
- Consider multiuse.

Major John Buttrick House	House (Low Impact Level)		Landscape (Medium Impact Level)	
	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Preferred Uses				
Gathering Space / Entertainment				
Conference Center (north side)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could share this use with park so that park may still use this space for occasional meetings. - If floor plan of structure was not altered, impact level would be low. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current floor plan configuration (many small rooms) would not lend itself well to be used as a conference center. - Would require some upgrading for both technology and building codes. - Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No additional parking would be needed (Visitor Center parking lot across the street). - Would have low impact on landscape. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could require septic upgrade.
Small Functions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intermittent use, could share with park to use for meetings when there is not a function. - Would become an income producing property. - Good exposure of park to public. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current floor plan configuration (many small rooms) may not be suitable for small functions. - Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission. - Could require building code upgrades (fire safety and ADA). - May have high impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No additional parking would be needed (Visitor Center parking lot across the street). - Would have low impact on landscape. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could require septic upgrade.
Residential				
Artist in Residence (multiple artist or artist with family)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could use garage (not in study) for studio space (would require little impact to garage- easy to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not contribute to the park mission but house is preserved for historic scene. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not require additional parking. - Would not require additional septic. 	

	<p>convert to open studio space).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compatible with historic use of house as a residence – would have low impact on structure. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would have low impact on landscape. 	
Park/Seasonal Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could combine this use with artisan crafts or general store. - Would be good compatibility with the park- tenants would have vested interest in maintaining property. - Would require minimal conversion cost. - Year- round occupation. - Compatible use with floor space/historic function of structure. - Added attraction to increase applicants for seasonal employment. - Use would have low impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not be economically feasible for park. - Would remove this structure from public use and enjoyment. - May introduce extra wear and tear as a result of transient housing. - Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission. - Transient nature may cause medium impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No additional septic needs would be required. - Would not require additional parking. - Low impact on landscape. 	
Miscellaneous	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Park Offices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use is compatible with park. - Could provide good meeting spaces for the park. - Close to park headquarters. - Would contribute to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Office needs such as IT and heavy equipment may have high impact on structure. - Use would not be consistent with historic function of structure. - Not an income producing property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimal parking would be required - parking available across the street. - Would not require additional septic. - Would have low impact on landscape. 	

	<p>park's mission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could accommodate additional offices that otherwise would be located in the Visitor Center. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment. - Could have high impact on structure. 		
Office Space for Non-profit (wireless internet)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potentially good, reliable, and permanent income. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requirements for office use could be too intrusive or may have extensive floor loading issues. - IT requirements could be too intrusive (wireless internet is not reliable and not entirely secure.) - May have high impact on structure. - Would not contribute to park's mission. - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimal parking would be required - parking available across the street. - May not require septic upgrade. - Would have low impact on landscape. 	
Less Preferred Uses				
Retail	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
General Store	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimal conversion needed for this use. - Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to park's mission. - Would be an income producing property. - Could combine use with artisan's crafts or park/seasonal housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If use occupied the second floor, structure would need to meet ADA requirements. - May cause traffic and congestion along road and disrupt historic scene. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking across the street may be sufficient. - Would not require additional septic. - Would have low impact on landscape. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could combine this use with a Tea House or Tavern. - If floor plan was not altered, could have low impact on structure. 				
Food Concession / Restaurant	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	
Restaurant/Tea House vs. Tavern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would be only food concession between Rte. 128 and downtown Concord. - Could combine this use with a General Store. - If floor plan was not altered, could have low impact on structure. - Could aid the park in becoming more of a “destination park” if so desired. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Major upgrading of kitchen would be required even if it was catered/brought in. - May cause traffic and congestion along road and disrupt historic scene. - Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park’s mission. - May not be an appropriate use in the “neighborhood” environment/context. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking across the street may be sufficient. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking may not be sufficient, additional parking may be required. - Would require septic upgrade (residential to commercial/restaurant). - Could have high impact on landscape. 	
Artisan Crafts	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	
Artisan Crafts (Glassblowing, Tinsmithing, Furniture Making, Candlestick Making, Cheese making)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Division of rooms could allow for more than one type of craft. - Could be an income producing property – admission charge. - Could combine use with general store or artists’ residence. - Would have low impact. - Garage (not included in study) could be used as 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not require additional parking. - Would not require additional septic. - Low impact on landscape. 		

	well. - Would continue agrarian tradition and contribute to park's mission.			
Non-Preferred Uses				
Interpretive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would contribute to park's mission (not to 1775 park mission). - Impact level would be low. - Could combine with park meeting space and seasonal housing (current uses). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would require a full Historic Structure Report to understand how structure appeared in 1775. - Would not be an income producing property. - Would be a common use of historic property for the park. - Would require additional interpretive staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not require additional parking. - Would not require additional septic. - Would provide an opportunity for an interpretation of the landscape verses just being the "setting." - Recent North Bridge Cultural Landscape Report could provide interpretive information for the landscape. - Low impact on landscape. 	Con

Noah Brooks Tavern, Rogers Barn, and Landscape



Current Use

House: Vacant.

Barn: NPS Maintenance Shop / Light Storage.

Impact

Structure: Medium Impact Level (18 out of a possible 36 points).

Barn: Medium Impact Level (20 out of a possible 36 points).

Landscape: Medium to Low Impact Level (19 out of a possible 24 points).

Issues

Parking:

Existing: 3 spaces available east of the main house.

Potential: Possibly 3 more spaces at end of driveway.

Total: 6 spaces.

Other: Extensive and unmarked gravel parking area behind the barn can accommodate between 20 and 40 cars. The access drive needs improvement and clear demarcation. Minor improvement such as minor grading, clearing of stone wall, and importing of gravel would be sufficient. Topography contributes favorably to a bigger lot as parking would be partially hidden behind a berm and the higher elevated road. A beautiful existing stone wall could be used as the eastern boundary of the parking lot, while the soon- to-be- built cattle fence could serve as the western boundary.

Septic:

Existing: Adequate septic exists for residential use.

Required: See attached septic information (will vary according to use).

Other

- House constructed in 1798, barn constructed in 1938.
- Most parking available on premises than any other site.
- Potentially combine new use with new use for Joshua Brooks Jr. House.

Noah Brooks Tavern	House (Medium Impact Level)		Rogers Barn (Medium Impact Level)		Landscape (Medium to Low Impact Level)	
Preferred Uses	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Combined Use House and Barn: Bed and Breakfast/Inn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desirable location, not many lodging choices in area. - Compatible with Rogers Barn for use as a Bed & Breakfast/Inn or used for functions. - Could combine this use with Joshua Brooks Jr. house as Bed & Breakfast / Inn. - Consistent use with historic function of structure (2nd floor lodging). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May introduce excessive wear and tear on historic structure due to transient nature. - May require additional bathrooms to be added to structure (one bathroom per bedroom). - Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission. - Would have medium impact to structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compatible use with Noah Brooks Tavern as a Bed & Breakfast as well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost of conversion for an Inn in Rogers Barn would be high. - Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission. - Would have high impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking potentially available behind Rogers Barn. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would require additional septic. - Would have medium impact on landscape.
- <i>Additional Alternative- Barn: Functions</i>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Great compatibility if Noah Brooks Tavern is used as a Bed & Breakfast / Inn. - Conversion requirements would be minimal. - Impact on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use would not be consistent with historic function of structure. - Would not continue agrarian tradition or contribute to park's mission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landscape setting would be ideal backdrop for this use. - Parking potentially available behind Rogers Barn. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would require additional septic. - Would have medium impact on landscape.

<p>- <i>Additional Alternative-</i> Barn: Artisan Crafts</p>			<p>structure would be low.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would capture people staying at the Inn. - Would capture people from the trail. - Desirable for visitors – may increase visitation to park. - May be economically profitable – admission charge. - Compatible use with floor space / historic function of structure. - Would contribute to park's mission. - Would have low impact. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not require additional septic. - Parking potentially available behind Rogers Barn. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low impact on landscape.
<p>House: Artisan in Residence Barn: Gallery</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would be compatible use if Barn is used for Artisan Crafts or Gallery. - Minimal conversion cost. - Compatible use with floor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Structure is large for one family – may be best suited to house more than one artist. - Structure may not have suitable studio space. - May require 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good match for artist residence. - Compatible use with existing floor space of structure. - Would have a low impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not generate enough interest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential parking available behind the barn. - Would not require additional septic needs. - Very low impact on 	

<p>space/historic function of structure. - Would have a low impact.</p>	<p>building code upgrading (ADA, fire safety, etc.) - Would not contribute to park's mission. - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment.</p>	<p>- Existing floor plan would not need to be altered. - Would have low impact.</p>	<p>- Space may be too large for use. - Use would not be consistent with historic function of structure. - Would not contribute to park's mission.</p>	<p>landscape.</p>	
<p>- <i>Additional Alternative-</i> Barn: Studio Space</p>			<p>- Would not require additional septic. - Would not require additional parking. - Low impact on landscape.</p>		
<p>- <i>Additional Alternative-</i> Barn: See Agriculture House: 1st Floor: Tavern /Restaurant, 2nd Floor: Inn Barn: Small Functions</p>	<p>- Would be only food concession between Rte. 128 and downtown Concord. - Existing large-sized kitchen may not need major upgrading. - Existing floor plan would not need to be</p>	<p>- Structure may require extensive building code upgrade (ADA, Fire Safety). - Transient nature of use may cause excess wear and tear on structure. - Would not contribute to</p>	<p>- Conversion requirements would be minimal. - Would have low impact on structure.</p>	<p>- Use would not be consistent with historic function of structure. - Would not contribute to park's mission.</p>	<p>- Landscape setting would be ideal backdrop for this use. - Parking potentially available behind Rogers Barn. - Would require additional septic. - Would have medium impact on landscape.</p>

<p>greatly altered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could restore 2nd floor to open floor plan as it was historically. - Would be consistent with historic function of structure. - Could be economically profitable. - Would have medium to low impact on structure. <hr/> <p>- <i>Additional Alternative-</i> Barn: See Agriculture</p>	<p>park's mission.</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not contribute to park's mission. - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimal conversion cost. - Impact to structure would be low. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not contribute to park's mission. - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost of conversion would be minimal- existing floor plan would not need to be altered. - Impact to structure would be low. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not be consistent with historic function of structure. - Would not contribute to park's mission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking potentially available behind Rogers Barn. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adequate septic for barn would need to be installed. - Would have medium impact on landscape.
<p>House: Social Director's Residence</p> <p>Barn: Theatre/Dances</p>							

House: Director of Conference Center Barn: Conference Center	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimal conversion cost. - Impact to structure would be low. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not contribute to park's mission. - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not contribute to park's mission. - Cost of conversion would be high and therefore have a high impact to structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking potentially available behind Rogers Barn. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adequate septic for barn would need to be installed. - Would have medium impact to structure.
House and Barn: National Academy of 18 th C. Life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Park could benefit greatly – use could provide training for interpretive employees within park. - Could be economically profitable – tuition charge. - Existing floor plan would not need to be altered. - Would contribute to park's mission. - Would have low impact to structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Difficulty in finding instructors / trainers in subject area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could be used for presentation and classroom space. - Would contribute to park's mission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost of conversion could be high. - Would have high impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking potentially available behind Rogers Barn. - Additional septic may not be required. - Would have low impact to landscape. 	
House: Office Space Barn: See Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potentially good, reliable economic income. - Floor space would not need to be altered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requirements for office (IT needs and heavy office equipment) use may be too intrusive. - Would not contribute to park's mission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would contribute to park's agrarian tradition and mission. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not require additional parking. - Would not require additional septic. - Low impact on landscape. 	

Agricultural	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Con	Pro	Con
Barn: Animals / Grazing		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment. - Would have high impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would continue agrarian tradition. - Would be in keeping with historic use. - Little conversion of space would be required. - Would have low impact to structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not be economically profitable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would be in keeping with the historic and agricultural scene. - No additional parking would be required. - No additional septic would be required. - Low impact on landscape. 		
Barn: Agricultural Sale Outlet			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would continue agrarian tradition of structure. - Minimal conversion would be required. - Would continue agrarian tradition of park. - Would have low impact to structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could potentially be limited to seasonal profitability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No additional septic would be required. - Parking potentially available behind Rogers Barn. - Low impact on landscape. 		

<p>Barn: Living History (w/ox team)</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would continue the agrarian tradition of the park. - Could be economically profitable (admission charge). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would require a large number of staff. - Would be a seasonal operation only. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would have adequate potential parking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landscape may not be large enough for this sort of operation. - Additional septic would be required. - Would have high impact on landscape.
--	--	--	--	---	--	---

Stow- Hardy House, Hovagimian Garage, and Landscape



Current Use

House: Vacant.

Barn: Vacant / NPS Light Storage.

Impact

Structure: Medium Impact Level (19 out of 36 possible points).

Garage: Medium Impact Level (18 out of 36 possible points).

Landscape: High Impact Level (14 out of 24 possible points).

Issues

Parking:

Existing: 2- 3 spaces.

Potential: None.

Other: The existing lot is small and difficult to navigate. There is little room to turn around, making the site complicated for visitor parking where people would be arriving and leaving with high frequency. With significant landscape alteration there may be more parking potential. Ideally, the appropriate design would have the Farwell Jones Site provide parking for this site.

Septic:

Existing: Adequate septic exists for residential use.

Required: See attached septic information (will vary according to use).

Other

- This structure is just post 1775 battle, constructed in 1786; garage constructed 1945.
- This property's use would be ideal to combine with Farwell Jones operation because of its close but somewhat removed location (could act as a support structure, i.e. residence to Farwell Jones operation.)
- Beware of impact to trail that abuts parcel on the northeast corner of parcel.

Stow- Hardy Site	House (Medium Impact Level)		Garage (Medium Impact Level)		Landscape (High Impact Level)	
Preferred Uses	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Combined Use House: Residence (Support residence for Farwell Jones operations, i.e. Farmer's or Director's residence) Garage: Storage (Farm Equipment)	- Would be ideal to be used as a residential support structure for Farwell Jones operations because of its proximity to the Farwell Jones site, but slight removal as well. - Would be consistent with historic function of structure. - Minimal conversion cost. - Low impact on structure.	- Would not directly contribute to park's mission. - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment.	- No conversion cost. - Use would be consistent with historic function of structure. - Impact would be low.	- Small space may limit the amount of items to be stored. - Would not directly contribute to park's mission.	- No additional septic would be required. - No additional parking would be required. - Low impact on landscape.	
House: Artist Residence Garage: Studio	- Would be consistent with historic function of structure. - Minimal conversion cost. - No alteration of floor plan would be required. - Great compatibility if garage is used as a studio or gallery. - Would have low impact on structure.	- If garage is not used as a studio, there might not be a good studio space within the house. - Space may be too large for one artist – perhaps better suited for multiple artists or artist and family. - Would not directly contribute to park's mission. - Would remove	- No conversion cost. - Impact would be low.	- Space may be too small for use as a gallery. - If used as a gallery, it may not be visible enough from road to attract visitors. - Would not directly contribute to park's mission. - Would not be consistent with	- No additional septic would be required.	- If garage is used as a gallery, additional parking would be required. - Would have medium impact on landscape.

			structure from public use and enjoyment.		historic function of structure.		
Less Preferred Uses							
Combined Use	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	
House: Interpretive Garage: Storage (Curatorial Storage for park)	- Exterior of structure in process of being restored for interpretive purposes. - Would contribute to park's mission. - Impact on structure would be low.	- May not be economically feasible - very expensive to restore interior. - Structure built 11 years post 1775 Battle. - Site may be too small to attract visitors. - Would require additional interpretive staff.	- Would provide needed storage space for the park on site. - Would contribute to park's mission. - Impact would be low.	- Small space may limit the amount of items to be stored. - Use would not be consistent with historic function of structure.	- No additional septic would be required.	- Would require additional parking. - Landscape has low interpretive value; view sheds are greatly different than 18 th C. - Would have medium impact on landscape.	
House: 1 st Floor: Gallery, 2 nd Floor: Residence Garage: Storage (Curatorial Storage for park)	- 2 nd floor use as a residence would be consistent with historic function of structure. - Would allow for single artist occupancy. - Minimal conversion cost. - Would have low impact on structure.	- Gallery may not generate enough interest. - Would not directly contribute to park's mission.	- Would provide needed storage space for the park on site. - Would contribute to park's mission. - Would have low impact on structure.	- Small space may limit the amount of items to be stored. - Use would not be consistent with historic function of structure.	- No additional septic would be required.	- Would require additional parking. - Would have medium impact on landscape.	

House: Small Restaurant / Food Concession Garage: Gallery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would capture people from the trail. - Currently no food concession between Rte. 128 and downtown Concord. - May attract visitors to park (combined use of food concession and gallery may attract more visitors than each use on its own.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conversion cost may be high. - Would not directly contribute to park's mission. - Could have high impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No conversion cost. - Impact would be low. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Space may be too small for use as a gallery. - Would not directly contribute to park's mission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional parking would be required. - Additional septic may be required. - Would have high impact on landscape.
House: Office (Nonprofit lease) Garage: Storage (Farm Equipment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could be used as the offices that support the operations at the Farwell Jones site. - Alteration of existing floor plan would be minimal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Office needs such as IT and heavy equipment may have high impact on structure. - Use would not be consistent with historic function of structure. - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No conversion cost. - Would contribute to the park's mission. - Would have low impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small space may limit the amount of items to be stored. - Use would not be consistent with historic function of structure. - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional parking would be required. - Additional septic may be required. - Would have high impact on landscape.

Joshua Brooks Jr. House and Landscape



Current Use: Vacant.

Impact

Structure: High Impact Level (12 out of 36 possible points).

Landscape: High Impact Level (14 out of 24 possible points).

Issues

Parking:

Existing: No official parking. Paved driveway (fair condition) can provide limited parking. One space available in front of garage.

Potential: 3 spaces possible in front of and next to garage. 2- 3 extra spaces possible in the driveway but clearly visible from the road and would have limiting circulation.

Total: 6 spaces.

Other: Short walk to Noah Brooks Tavern and its parking lot.

Septic:

Existing: Adequate septic (3 bathrooms) for residential use but in poor condition.

Required: See attached septic information (will vary according to use).

Other

- House constructed ca. 1779 - 1781, just post 1775 Battle.
- Tie new use w/Noah Brooks Tavern – could be more economically feasible/profitable (short walk between two properties but slightly dangerous).

Joshua Brooks Jr. Site	House (High Impact Level)		Landscape (High Impact Level)	
	Pro		Con	
	Pro		Con	
Preferred Uses				
Residential				
Park Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would be good compatibility with the park-tenants would have vested interest in maintaining property. - Would require minimal conversion cost. - Year-round occupation. - Use would be consistent with historic function on structure. - Would have low impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use would not attract visitors to the park. - Would not contribute to the park's mission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No additional septic needs would be required. - No additional parking would be required. - Would have low impact on landscape. 	
Artist Residence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Setting somewhat removed from park, site is very residential. - Residential use would be consistent with historic function of structure. - Rear ell / modern garage could be a good studio space. - Would have low impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not contribute to park's mission. - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not require additional parking. - Would not require additional septic. - Would have low impact on landscape. 	
Gathering Space / Entertainment	Pro		Con	
Small Functions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intermittent use, could share with park to use for meetings when there is not a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current floor plan configuration (many small rooms) may not be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grounds and landscape provide a beautiful setting for this use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional septic would be required. - Additional parking

	<p>function.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would become an income producing property. - Good exposure of park to public. 	<p>suitable for small functions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not contribute to park's mission. - Could require building code upgrades (fire safety and ADA). - May have high impact on structure. 		<p>would be required (perhaps at Noah Brooks Tavern Site.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would have high impact on landscape.
Miscellaneous	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Office Space (Profit / Non profit lease)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could be used as the offices that support the operations at the Noah Brooks site. - Alteration of existing floor plan would be minimal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not contribute to park's mission. - Office needs such as IT and heavy equipment may have high impact on structure. - Use would not be consistent with historic function of structure. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional parking would be required. - Additional septic may be required. - Would have medium impact on landscape.
Less Preferred Uses				
Residential	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Bed & Breakfast / Inn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could be an extension of the Noah Brooks Tavern if Noah Brooks house is used as a Tavern on 1st floor and Bed & Breakfast / Inn on the 2nd floor. - May promote visitation to park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional bathrooms may need to be added to structure (one bathroom per bedroom). - May introduce excessive wear and tear on historic structure due to transient nature. - Would not contribute to park's mission. - Would have medium impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking could be provided by Noah Brooks Tavern site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional septic would be required. - Additional parking may be required. - Would have high impact on landscape.

Private Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residential use would be consistent with historic function of structure. - No change in floor plan would be required (no conversion cost). - Would have low impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not contribute to park's mission. - Would remove structure from public use and enjoyment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not require additional parking. - Would not require additional septic. - Would have low impact on landscape. 	
Food Concession / Restaurant	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Tavern / Tea House	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could be the Tea House / Tavern extension if the entire Noah Brooks house is used a Bed & Breakfast / Inn. - Would increase likelihood of steady clientele from Bed & Breakfast / Inn operation. - Would contribute to historic scene of park. - Currently there is no food concession / restaurant between Rte. 128 and downtown Concord. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poor visibility from road. - May need extensive kitchen upgrading. - May require extensive building code upgrading (ADA, Fire Safety). - Could have high impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking could be provided by Noah Brooks Tavern site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional parking may be required. - Septic capacity is limited - additional septic would be required. - Would have high impact on landscape.

George Hall House and Landscape



Current Use: Vacant.

Impact

Structure: High Impact Level (13 out of 36 possible points).

Landscape: High Impact Level (15 out of 24 possible points).

Issues

Parking:

Existing: No existing parking.

Potential: The site can accommodate a significant number of cars (15- 20).

Total: 15- 20 spaces.

Other: The parking would have to be located behind the structure and/or across the side road on existing meadow. Due to existing vegetation and location of structure, most cars would not be seen from the main road in this location.

Septic:

Existing: No existing septic. Septic needs could potentially be met with the use of composting system.

Required: See attached septic information (will vary according to use).

Other

- House constructed 1865.
- New use should be concentrated on non residential/full- time housing because of the non- extant septic system and great parking potential.
- Landscape is rocky and archaeologically sensitive.

George Hall House	House (High Impact Level)		Landscape (High Impact Level)	
	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Preferred Uses Food Concession / Restaurant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Currently there is no food concession between Rte. 128 and downtown Concord. - Historically, food concessions have been in/around this location. - Would have low impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not have appropriate space / room for food preparation. - Would not contribute to park's mission. - Not consistent with historic function of structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excellent parking potential. - Low impact on landscape. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No septic installed (would need to use composting system.)
Retail Gallery (1 st floor: gallery, 2 nd floor: residence)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2nd floor use as a residence would be consistent with historic function of structure. - Would allow for single artist occupancy. - Minimal conversion cost. - Would have low impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gallery may not generate enough interest. - Would not directly contribute to park's mission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excellent parking potential. - Low impact on landscape. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No septic installed (would need to use composting system.)
General Store	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimal conversion needed to space for this use. - Could combine this use with small food concessions. - Would contribute to historic scene. - Would be an income producing property. - If floor plan was not altered, could have low impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consistent "coming and going" may cause traffic and congestion along road and disrupt historic scene. - Would not directly contribute to park's mission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excellent parking potential. - Low impact on landscape. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No septic installed (would need to use composting system.)

Miscellaneous	Offices	Pro - Alteration of existing floor plan would be minimal.	Con - Would not contribute to park's mission. - Use would not be consistent with historic function of structure. - Would remove structure from public enjoyment and use. - Office needs such as IT and heavy equipment may have high impact on structure.	Pro - Would not require additional parking. - Impact to landscape would be low.	Con - No septic installed (would need to use composting system.)
Other	Curatorial Storage	Pro - Would contribute to park's mission. - Existing floor plan would not need to be greatly altered. - Minimal conversion cost. - Would have low impact to structure.	Con - Would not be consistent with historic function of structure. - This new use would remove the structure from public use and enjoyment.	Pro - No septic required. - No parking required. - Would have low impact to landscape.	Con
Educational	Farm School Housing Partner	Pro - Use would be compatible if a Farm School was located within the park. - Use would be consistent with historic function of structure. - Minimal conversion cost. - Floor plan would not need to be altered. - Would continue agrarian tradition of park. - Would have low impact.	Con - Would not contribute to park's primary mission (1775). - Use would remove the structure from public use and enjoyment.	Pro - Adequate parking potential.	Con - Would require septic (composting system may not be sufficient as well). - If septic installed, impact to landscape would be high.

Less Preferred Uses					
Residential	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	
Youth Hostel	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Compatible use with floor space/historic function of structure.- Could be economically feasible – floor plan would not need to be greatly altered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Could require extensive building code upgrade (ADA, Fire Safety).- House may be too small.- Would not contribute to park’ mission.- Location is not easily accessible by public transportation.- Transient nature of use may have high impact on structure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Excellent parking potential.- Low impact on landscape.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- No septic installed (would need to use composting system.)	
Non- Preferred Uses					
Residential	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	
Park Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Would be good compatibility with the Park- tenants would have vested interest in maintaining property.- Would require minimal conversion cost.- Year- round occupation.- Use would be consistent with historic function of structure.- Would have low impact on structure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- May not be economically feasible for park.- Would remove structure from public enjoyment and use.- Would not contribute to park’s mission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- May not require additional parking.- Impact on landscape would be low.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- No septic installed (would need to use composting system.)	
Seasonal Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Compatible use with floor space/historic function of structure.- Good compatibility for the Park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- May introduce extra wear and tear as a result of transient housing.- Transient nature may cause medium impact on	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- May not require additional parking.- Impact on landscape would be low.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- No septic installed (would need to use composting system.)	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Added attraction to increase applicants for seasonal employment.- Minimal conversion cost.- Would have low impact on structure.	structure.		
--	---	------------	--	--

Gowing- Clarke House and Landscape



Current Use: NPS Residence.

Impact

Structure: High Impact Level (14 out of 36 possible points).

Landscape: High Impact Level (15 out of 24 possible points).

Issues

Parking:

Existing: 3 undesignated spaces on eastern side of the house (on gravel).

Potential: Space can accommodate approximately 6 spaces if correctly designed without disturbing the barn foundations.

Total: 6 spaces.

Other: This is a dangerous intersection therefore parking would not be recommended for visitors; rather it would be safer for park personnel familiar with traffic patterns.

Septic:

Existing: Adequate residential septic exists for 4 bedrooms.

Required: See attached septic information (will vary according to use).

Other

- House constructed 1836.

Gowing- Clarke House	House (High Impact Level)		Landscape (High Impact Level)	
	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
	Preferred Uses			
Residential Park Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would be good compatibility with the park-tenants would have vested interest in maintaining property. - Would require minimal conversion cost. - Use would be consistent with historic function of structure. - Would have low impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not be economically feasible for park. - Would remove the structure from public use and enjoyment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not require additional parking. - May not require additional septic. - Would have low impact on landscape. 	
Seasonal Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compatible use with floor space/historic function of structure. - Good compatibility for the Park. - Added attraction to increase applicants for seasonal employment. - Minimal conversion cost. - Would have low impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May introduce extra wear and tear as a result of transient housing. - Would remove the structure from public use and enjoyment. - Transient nature may cause medium impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not require additional parking. - May not require additional septic. - Would have low impact on landscape. 	

Youth Hostel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compatible use with floor space/historic function of structure. - Floor plan would not need to be greatly altered. - Location is not easily accessible by public transportation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not be economically feasible – could require extensive building code upgrade (ADA, Fire Safety). - House may be too small. - Transient nature of use may have high impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not require additional parking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May require additional septic. - If additional septic would be required, impact on landscape would be high.
Artist in Residence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use would be consistent with historic function of structure. - Floor plan would not need to be altered. - Would have low impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would remove the structure from public use and enjoyment. - Would not contribute to park's mission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not require additional parking. - May not require additional septic. - Would have low impact on landscape. 	
Miscellaneous	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Park Offices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use is compatible with park. - Could provide good meeting spaces for the park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May be too far removed from park headquarters. - Use would not be consistent with historic function of structure. - Would remove the structure from public use and enjoyment. - Office needs such as IT and heavy equipment may have high impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not require additional parking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May require additional septic. - If additional septic would be required, impact on landscape would be high.

Samuel Brooks House and Landscape



Current Use: Vacant and Occasional Small Functions.

Impact

Structure: Medium to Low Impact Level (23 out of 36 possible points).

Landscape: Medium Impact Level (18 out of 24 possible points).

Issues

Parking:

Existing: 8- 12 spaces available east of the site in a designated parking area.

Potential: Possible expansion of lot obtaining an additional 12 spaces.

Total: 24 spaces.

Other: The existing parking lot is correctly sized and not exceedingly imposing on the landscape. Because there are no significant shade trees, and the site is surrounded by farm land, enlarging the existing parking lot may create an overwhelming mass of cars not appropriate for the area.

Septic:

Existing: Adequate septic installed for residential use.

Required: See attached septic information (will vary according to use).

Other

- Witness structure, constructed 1728.

Samuel Brooks Site	House (Medium to Low Impact)		Landscape (Medium Impact Level)	
	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Preferred Uses Gathering Space / Entertainment Small Functions (Seating Capacity is 50)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intermittent use, could share with park to use for meetings when there is not a function. - Would become an income producing property. - Good exposure of park to public. - Floor plan would not need to be altered. - Would have low impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kitchen may need to be upgraded and expanded for food preparation and service. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Idyllic setting for this use. - May not require additional septic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would require additional parking. - Would have medium impact on landscape.
Food Concession / Restaurant Tea House / Tavern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Currently no food concessions between Rte. 128 and downtown Concord. - Close proximity to trail. - Would contribute to historic scene. - Floor plan would not need to be altered. - Would have low impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kitchen may need to be upgraded and expanded for food preparation and service. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Idyllic setting for this use. - May have adequate parking potential. - Would have low impact on landscape. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May require additional septic.
18 th Century Cooking Classes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not require an alteration in floor plan. - Farms from other properties in the park could supply produce. - Would contribute to park's 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kitchen may need to be upgraded and expanded for food preparation and service. - Could potentially be a dangerous use (fire). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May have adequate parking potential. - May have adequate parking potential. - Would have low impact on landscape. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May require additional septic.

	<p>mission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would have high interpretive value. - Could combine this use with interpretation and/or living history use. - Would have low impact on structure. 			
Interpretive	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Interpretive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would contribute to park's mission. - Great proximity to trail and would easily attract visitors. - Has already been restored. - Could potentially be combined with other uses. - Would add to the visitor's experience and understanding of park mission. - Would have low impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would require additional interpretive staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opportunity for the landscape to be interpreted and not to serve as just a "setting". - May have adequate septic. - May have adequate parking potential. - Would have low impact on landscape. 	
Less Preferred Uses				
Residential	Pro	Con	Pro	Con
Bed & Breakfast / Inn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could share this use with Noah Brooks Tavern site/ Joshua Brooks Jr. site. - May promote visitation to park. - Close proximity to trail would be a plus for lodgers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional bathrooms may need to be added to structure (one bathroom per bedroom). - May introduce excessive wear and tear on historic structure due to transient nature. - Would have medium impact on structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May have adequate parking potential. - May not require additional septic. - Would have low impact on landscape. 	

APPENDIX

Minute Man National Historical Park

Battle Road Structure Survey Phase I

DRAFT

October 2004

REVISED

June 2005

National Park Service

Historic Architecture Program

Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation

**Minute Man National Historical Park
Battle Road Structure Survey
Phase I**

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Impact Assessment per Structure.....	2
Impact Assessment per Landscape.....	3
Methodology for Significance, Integrity, and Allowable Impact Assessment.....	4
Summary of Methodology for Significance Assessment	7
Integrity Assessment Worksheets	8
Significance and Integrity Matrix	11

Introduction

The goal of this project is to determine acceptable impact levels using a systematic methodology to determine potential reuses for fourteen structures and their ten respective sites in Minute Man National Historical Park. A fifteenth structure (Farwell Jones Produce Stand) was eliminated from the study due to new information that documented its date of construction as 1960. Of the forty nine structures that the park has entered into the List of Classified Structures (LCS), fourteen structures and ten sites were identified by the park staff as potential reusable resources. Phase I of this project will determine an allowable impact assessment per structure and site; Phase II of this project will use the findings from Phase I to provide the park with the information that will outline these sites' reuse and ultimate treatment to be included in the General Management Plan.

For Phase I, a methodology was created that evaluated both the structures and the landscapes that allowed for the greatest amount of information per site to be considered to inform the final impact assessment. Several documents were utilized in the determination of significance; the primary document referenced was the park's National Register Nomination along with the consultation of available historic structure reports. Once the determination of significance was established, architectural and historical integrity could be assessed. The primary guide utilized in the assessment of integrity was *The National Register Bulletin 15: How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Property*. A walk-through of each structure and landscape was performed evaluating each of these seven aspects of integrity in situ. The final product resulted in a matrix that simultaneously outlined each structure's and site's significance and integrity, which when added together generated the impact assessment.

MIMA
Battle Road Structure Survey
Impact Assessment

Impact Rating per Structure

Structure	Out of 36 possible points
Joshua Brooks Jr. House	12 (GAI)*
George Minot / Hall House	13
Gowing-Clarke House	14
Olive Stow Garage	18
Noah Brooks Tavern	18
John Nelson Barn	19
Olive Stow House	19
Rogers Barn	20
McHugh Barn	20
James Carty (Farwell Jones) Barn	20
Samuel Brooks House	23
Farwell Jones House**	27
John Nelson House**	27
Major John Buttrick House	28 (LAI)*
<p>* Greatest Acceptable Impact (GAI) to Least Acceptable Impact (LAI)</p> <p>**It is thought that some portion of the structure may be a witness structure; more research and physical evidence is needed to be certain.</p>	

MIMA
Battle Road Structure Survey
Impact Assessment

Impact Rating per Landscape

Landscape	Out of 24 possible points
Olive Stow Site (House and Garage)	14 (GAI)*
Joshua Brooks Jr. Site	14
George Minot / Hall House Site	15
Gowing-Clarke House Site	15
John Nelson Site (House and Barn)	16
Farwell Jones Site (House and James Carty Barn)	18
Samuel Brooks House Site	18
Major John Buttrick House Site	18
Noah Brooks Tavern Site (House and Rogers Barn)	19
McHugh Barn Site	21 (LAI)*
* Greatest Acceptable Impact (GAI) to Least Acceptable Impact (LAI)	

Methodology for Significance, Integrity, and Impact Assessment

Methodology for Rating Significance:

The National Register Nomination for Minute Man National Historical Park identifies six areas of significance: military, commemoration, architecture, literature, agriculture, and archaeology. Upon reviewing the nomination, it was determined that the fourteen sites involved in this project contain significance in three areas, on both the national and local levels. On the national level, some sites contain significance in the area of military; on the local level, sites contain significance in the area of architecture and agriculture. We have assigned a rating in each area of significance for both the structure and the landscape on a scale of zero to five. A rating of one indicates the lowest possible significance a structure or landscape embodies in the particular area of significance and a rating of five indicates the highest significance a structure or landscape embodies in the particular area of significance.

It was also determined that all sites within the Minute Man National Historical Park are archaeologically significant and archaeological investigation must take place before any ground disturbance. Listed below are the areas of significance for the fourteen and 10 landscapes that are the focus of this study and the methodology that was utilized to assign a rating in each area of significance.

National Significance:

Military (c. 1775):

Structure Significance: Any structure that was witness to the Battle of Lexington and Concord is considered to reflect national significance in the military category and is given the highest possible rating of a five. All other non-witness structures are given a zero for military significance.

Landscape Significance: The primary mission of the park, as stated in the National Register Nomination of Historic Places, has been to “approximate the cultural environment that existed in 1775 and preserve and interpret individual resources that contribute to understanding the events of the Battle of Lexington and Concord,” which were the events that commenced the American Revolutionary War. For this reason, the entire park’s landscape is considered to be nationally significant in the category of military; therefore, all landscapes are given the highest significance rating of a five.

Local Significance:

Architecture:

Structure Significance: In the National Register Nomination for Minute Man National Historical Park the significance criterion of architecture is considered to be locally significant. Therefore, we assigned four points as the highest rating that a structure could receive for the significance criterion of architecture. All structures have a minimum rating of three in this category due to the statement in

the National Register Nomination: “Architecturally, the district embodies a collection of dwellings that are representative of local building trends from the early eighteenth century through the mid-twentieth century.” However, if a particular structure is specifically mentioned in the National Register Nomination as being architecturally significant, the structure was given a higher rating of four.

Landscape Significance: All sites are given a zero for landscape significance in the area of architecture, as it is not applicable.

Agriculture (up to c. 1951):

Structure Significance: For each structure that is specifically mentioned in the National Register Nomination for agricultural significance, a significance rating of a four was given. The same rating was also given to a structure if it is a farmhouse associated with a landscape that the National Register Nomination recognizes as agriculturally significant, even if this farmhouse is not specifically mentioned. A significance rating of a three was given to structures that are typically associated with agriculture, such as a barn, even if neither the structure nor the landscape is specifically mentioned in the National Register Nomination. All other structures not specifically mentioned as being significant in the area of agriculture, not associated with a landscape that was specifically mentioned in the National Register Nomination, or that are not typically associated with agriculture, were given a significance rating of a zero.

Landscape Significance: All landscapes are considered locally significant in the area of agriculture and were given a minimum rating of three due to the statement in the National Register Nomination, “The history of the district is inextricably tied to agriculture, which was the primary economic activity carried on there throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.” If a particular landscape is mentioned in the National Register Nomination as containing agricultural significance, a higher rating of four was given.

Methodology for Integrity Assessment:

The *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Property* was referenced to in order to evaluate the integrity of each structure and landscape listed within the project. As stated in the *National Register Bulletin 15*, integrity is the ability of structure or landscape to convey its significance and whether or not the property retains the identity for which it is significant. Within the *National Register Bulletin 15*, seven aspects of integrity are cited that help to define the integrity of a cultural site. Listed below are these seven aspects of integrity and their definitions:

Seven Aspects of Integrity:

- 1. Location:** Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
- 2. Design:** Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
- 3. Setting:** Setting is the physical environment of a historic property.
- 4. Materials:** Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
- 5. Workmanship:** Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.
- 6. Feeling:** Feeling is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
- 7. Association:** Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

The integrity of the structures and the landscapes were evaluated independently, as each has different elements that help to define its integrity. For each area of significance a spreadsheet was created that listed each site, including both the structure and the landscape. One point was given to each aspect of integrity for each structure and landscape if it was determined that the structure or landscape still retained this aspects of integrity for which it is considered significant. Alternatively, a zero was given in each aspect of integrity for both the structure and landscape if it was determined that structure or landscape no longer retained that aspect of integrity.

Because a building's integrity is evaluated largely in part on the structural components that comprise its whole, an aid for evaluating each aspect of integrity for the structures was needed. A spreadsheet was created for each structure that listed individual structural elements and the various known alterations that occurred to each element over time. These spreadsheets were a tool for internal use that summarized the alterations of a structure and gave a quick insight to help evaluate integrity of each building.

Methodology for Impact Assessment:

The impact assessment per site is presented as a whole number and was determined by an integrated look at each site's significance and integrity. The ratings for a structure's significance and integrity were entered into a matrix and were added together for a maximum number of 36 points. The higher the number, the less acceptable impact per structure, and vice versa. A parallel methodology was used to determine the acceptable impact per landscape. The ratings for each landscape's significance and integrity were added together for a maximum of 24 points. Similarly to the acceptable impact for each structure, the higher the result, the less acceptable impact per landscape.

MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Summary of Methodology for Significance Assessment

National Significance: Military	
Structure Significance	Landscape Significance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-witness structures = 0 • Witness structures = 5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All witness = 5
Local Significance: Architecture	
Structure Significance	Landscape Significance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All locally significant = 3 • Specifically mentioned in the National Register Nomination = 4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable = 0
Local Significance: Agriculture	
Structure Significance	Landscape Significance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not specifically mentioned in the National Register Nomination, not associated with a landscape specifically mentioned in the National Register Nomination, not a barn or a farmstead = 0 • Not specifically mentioned in the National Register Nomination, not associated with a landscape specifically mentioned in the National Register Nomination, but is agriculturally related = 3 • Not specifically mentioned in the National Register Nomination but is a farmstead associated with a landscape that is specifically mentioned in the National Register Nomination = 4 • Specifically mentioned in the National Register Nomination = 4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All locally significant = 3 • Specifically mentioned in the National Register Nomination = 4

**MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Integrity Assessment Worksheets**

Integrity Assessment for the Area of National Significance of Military, 1775								
Seven Aspects of Integrity:								
	Location	Design	Setting	Materials	Workmanship	Feeling	Association	Total
Joshua Brooks Jr. Site:								
Structure Integrity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Landscape Integrity	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
Noah Brooks Site:								
Structure Integrity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Landscape Integrity	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3
Samuel Brooks Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	5
Landscape Integrity	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3
Major John Buttrick Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
Landscape Integrity	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3
Gowing-Clarke Site:								
Structure Integrity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Landscape Integrity	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Farwell Jones Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Landscape Integrity	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Farwell Jones Barn Site:								
Structure Integrity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Landscape Integrity	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
McHugh Barn Site:								
Structure Integrity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Landscape Integrity	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	5
John Nelson Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Landscape Integrity	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
John Nelson Barn Site:								
Structure Integrity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Landscape Integrity	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Rogers Barn Site:								
Structure Integrity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Landscape Integrity	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3
Olive Stow Site:								
Structure Integrity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Landscape Integrity	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Olive Stow Garage Site:								
Structure Integrity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Landscape Integrity	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
George Minot/Hall Site:								
Structure Integrity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Landscape Integrity	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2

**MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Integrity Assessment Worksheets**

Integrity Assessment for the Area of Local Significance of Architecture								
Seven Aspects of Integrity:								
	Location	Design	Setting	Materials	Workmanship	Feeling	Association	Total
Joshua Brooks House (ca.1780)								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	4
Noah Brooks Tavern (1798)								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
Samuel Brooks House (1758)								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	4
Major John Buttrick House (1715/1937)								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
Gowing-Clarke House (1836)								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
Farwell Jones House (1700/ca.1850s)								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
Farwell Jones Barn (1903)								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
McHugh Barn (1939)								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
John Nelson House (ca.1810)								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
John Nelson Barn (ca.1810, 1900)								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
Rogers Barn (1800/1938)								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
Olive Stow House (1786)								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
Olive Stow Garage (1945)								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
Minot/Hall House (1865)								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6

**MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Integrity Assessment Worksheets**

Integrity Assessment for the Area of Local Significance of Agriculture, up to 1951								
Seven Aspects of Integrity:								
	Location	Design	Setting	Materials	Workmanship	Feeling	Association	Total
Joshua Brooks Jr. Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	4
Landscape Integrity	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
Noah Brooks Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	5
Landscape Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Samuel Brooks Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	5
Landscape Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Major John Buttrick Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Landscape Integrity	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Gowing-Clarke Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	8
Landscape Integrity	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	5
Farwell Jones Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Landscape Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Farwell Jones Barn Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Landscape Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
McHugh Barn Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Landscape Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
John Nelson Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Landscape Integrity	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
John Nelson Barn Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Landscape Integrity	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Rogers Barn Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Landscape Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Olive Stow Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Landscape Integrity	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	4
Olive Stow Garage Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	6
Landscape Integrity	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	4
George Minot/Hall Site:								
Structure Integrity	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	4
Landscape Integrity	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	5

**MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Significance and Integrity Matrix**

Site	Date of Extant Structure	Significance Category	Site Significance	Structure Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Structure Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)
Joshua Brooks Jr. House	ca. 1781	Military 1775	NR: Minute Man National Historical Park derives its primary significance as the site of the Battle of Lexington and Concord that marked the beginning of the American Revolutionary War.	0	0	5	3
		Architectural	NR: Architecturally, the district embodies a collection of dwellings that are representative of local building trends from the early eighteenth century through the mid twentieth century. The Joshua Brooks house was the first of the post-Colonial period buildings constructed in the district. It is an excellent example of the transition from the Georgian style of the Colonial period to the Federal style that occurred after the Revolutionary War. The building retains the symmetrical five-bay façade that was common in the Georgian period. Its classical entrance surround, however, is more finely crafted than those of the Colonial period houses in the district. The surround features a gable pediment on a molded entablature and fluted Doric pilasters.	4	4	0	0
		Agricultural to 1951	NR: The history of the district is inextricably tied to agriculture, which was the primary economic activity carried on there throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. P. Weinbaum Comments: Agriculturally significant due to its association with the Brooks Tannery which was owned and operated across the road from the Joshua Brooks house until the 1820s.	0	4	3	3
Total				4	8	8	6
Allowed Impact: Subtotal out of 36 and 24 possible points respectively				12	14		

**MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Significance and Integrity Matrix**

Site	Date of Extant Structure	Significance Category	Site Significance	Structure Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Structure Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)
Noah Brooks Tavern	ca. 1798	Military 1775	NR: Minute Man National Historical Park derives its primary significance as the site of the Battle of Lexington and Concord that marked the beginning of the American Revolutionary War. A skirmish occurred at Brooks Hill and the fighting was intense, especially in the immediate vicinity of Brooks Tavern.	0	0	5	3
		Architectural	NR: Architecturally, the district embodies a collection of dwellings that are representative of local building trends from the early eighteenth century through the mid twentieth century. The Noah Brooks Tavern is a great example of Federal period architecture in the district. The structure is a rare example of a building that features a wood sheathed façade and brick side walls. P. Weinbaum Comments: The Noah Brooks Tavern is one of only two buildings in the park that evidence Federal period style. LCS: The Noah Brooks Tavern is a good example of a Federal style house used as a tavern for about 30 years; the structure possesses great architectural integrity.	4	6	0	0
		Agricultural to 1951	NR: The history of the district is inextricably tied to agriculture, which was the primary economic activity carried on there throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. HSR: Significance lies in its operation as a apple and dairy farm from the 1850s through the 1930s.	3	5	4	7
Total				7	11	9	10
Allowed Impact: Subtotal out of 36 and 24 possible points respectively				18	19		

MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Significance and Integrity Matrix

Site	Date of Extant Structure	Significance Category	Site Significance	Structure Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Structure Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)
Samuel Brooks House	ca. 1728	Military 1775	NR: Minute Man National Historical Park derives its primary significance as the site of the Battle of Lexington and Concord that marked the beginning of the American Revolutionary War. The house was extant April 19, 1775 as a witness structure to the battle.	5	5	5	3
		Architectural	NR: Architecturally, the district embodies a collection of dwellings that are representative of local building trends from the early eighteenth century to the mid-twentieth century. The Samuel Brooks house retains a relatively high degree of its Colonial period integrity. LCS: The Samuel Brooks house is significant for its architecture, as an example of Georgian style.	4	4	0	0
		Agricultural to 1951	NR: The history of the district is inextricably tied to agriculture, which was the primary economic activity carried on there throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. HSR: The Samuel Brooks House was a homestead for an operating farm throughout the nineteenth century. P. Weinbaum Comments: While the building is not specifically referenced in the discussion of agricultural significance, the granting of land in the 17th century to Joshua Brooks is discussed and should be considered with this building, situated on land granted to Joshua as significant in the area of agriculture.	0	5	3	7
Total				9	14	8	10
Allowed Impact: Subtotal out of 36 and 24 possible points respectively				23		18	

**MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Significance and Integrity Matrix**

Site	Date of Extant Structure	Significance Category	Site Significance	Structure Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Structure Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)
Major John Buttrick House	ca. 1715	Military 1775	NR: Minute Man National Historical Park derives its primary significance as the site of the Battle of Lexington and Concord that marked the beginning of the American Revolutionary War. Major John Buttrick, a militia leader, led the first American troops into the battle and also ordered the first fire against the British. It was this command that started the American Revolutionary War. The house was extant April 19, 1775 as a witness structure to the battle.	5	3	5	3
		Architectural (?) 1937	NR: Architecturally, the district embodies a collection of dwellings that are representative of local building trends from the early eighteenth century through the mid twentieth century. The Major John Buttrick house was remodeled several times during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but retains the general massing and exterior elements that classify it as a Colonial period dwelling. The structure retains high degree of Colonial period integrity.	4	6	0	0
		Agricultural to 1951	NR: The history of the district is inextricably tied to agriculture, which was the primary economic activity carried on there throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. As in many other towns in Middlesex County, intensive vegetable gardening for Boston and overseas markets changed the nature of farming in Concord, Lincoln, and Lexington. Commercial production of fruit, vegetables, and dairy products soon became a mainstay of the town's economy at farms such as the Major John Buttrick House.	3	7	4	6
Total				12	16	9	9
Allowed Impact: Subtotal out of 36 and 24 possible points respectively				28		18	

**MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Significance and Integrity Matrix**

Site	Date of Extant Structure	Significance Category	Site Significance	Structure Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Structure Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)
Gowing-Clarke House	ca. 1836	Military 1775	NR: Minute Man National Historical Park derives its primary significance as the site of the Battle of Lexington and Concord that marked the beginning of the American Revolutionary War.	0	0	5	2
		Architectural	NR: Architecturally, the district embodies a collection of dwellings that are representative of local building trends from the early eighteenth century through the mid twentieth century. The Gowing-Clarke house is fine example of a Federal style house. HSR: The Gowing-Clarke house is significant to MIMA NHP as an example of nineteenth century farmhouse along Battle Road.	4	6	0	0
		Agricultural to 1951	NR: The history of the district is inextricably tied to agriculture, which was the primary economic activity carried on there throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. LCS: Represents a continuation of eighteenth century agrarian tradition.	0	4	3	5
Total				4	10	8	7
Allowed Impact: Subtotal out of 36 and 24 possible points respectively				14	15		

**MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Significance and Integrity Matrix**

Site	Date of Extant Structure	Significance Category	Site Significance	Structure Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Structure Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)
Farwell Jones House	ca. 1716	Military 1775	NR: Minute Man National Historical Park derives its primary significance as the site of the Battle of Lexington and Concord that marked the beginning of the American Revolutionary War. The house was extant April 19, 1775 as a witness structure to the battle.	5	2	5	2
		Architectural	NR: Architecturally, the district embodies a collection of dwellings that are representative of local building trends from the early eighteenth century through the mid twentieth century. Although remodeled extensively in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the structure retains the general massing and exterior elements that identify it as a Colonial period dwelling.	4	6	0	0
		Agricultural to 1951	NR: The history of the site is inextricably tied to agriculture, which was the primary economic activity carried on there throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.	3	7	4	7
Total				12	15	9	9
Allowed Impact: Subtotal out of 36 and 24 possible points respectively				27	18		

**MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Significance and Integrity Matrix**

Site	Date of Extant Structure	Significance Category	Site Significance	Structure Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Structure Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)
The Barn at the Farwell Jones House	ca. 1903	Military 1775	NR: Minute Man National Historical Park derives its primary significance as the site of the Battle of Lexington and Concord that marked the beginning of the American Revolutionary War.	0	0	5	2
		Architectural	NR: Architecturally, the district embodies a collection of dwellings that are representative of local building trends from the early eighteenth century through the mid twentieth century.	3	6	0	0
		Agricultural to 1951	NR: The history of the district is inextricably tied to agriculture, which was the primary economic activity carried on there throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The Farwell Jones Dairy Barn is an example of farm properties in Concord that were involved in market gardening and dairying during the modern period. LCS: The barn at the Farwell Jones house was part of agrarian tradition of the area, continuing into the 20th century. The barn is associated with historic use of Farwell Jones property and a component of the farm landscape.	4	7	4	7
Total				7	13	9	9
Allowed Impact: Subtotal out of 36 and 24 possible points respectively				20		18	

**MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Significance and Integrity Matrix**

Site	Date of Extant Structure	Significance Category	Site Significance	Structure Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Structure Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)
McHugh Barn	ca. 1939	Military 1775	NR: Minute Man National Historical Park derives its primary significance as the site of the Battle of Lexington and Concord that marked the beginning of the American Revolutionary War.	0	0	5	5
		Architectural	NR: Architecturally, the district embodies a collection of dwellings that are representative of local building trends from the early eighteenth century through the mid twentieth century.	3	6	0	0
		Agricultural to 1951	NR: The history of the district is inextricably tied to agriculture, which was the primary economic activity carried on there throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The McHugh barn is located one of the farms that continued through the modern period. The farm contained piggy and produced poultry, vegetables, and fruit. LCS: A good example of agrarian tradition.	4	7	4	7
Total				7	13	9	12
Allowed Impact: Subtotal out of 36 and 24 possible points respectively				20	21		

**MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Significance and Integrity Matrix**

Site	Date of Extant Structure	Significance Category	Site Significance	Structure Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Structure Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)
John Nelson House	ca. 1810	Military 1775	NR: Minute Man National Historical Park derives its primary significance as the site of the Battle of Lexington and Concord that marked the beginning of the American Revolutionary War.	5	2	5	2
		Architectural	NR: Architecturally, the district embodies a collection of dwellings that are representative of local building trends from the early eighteenth century through the mid twentieth century. The John Nelson house is a fine example of a Federal style house. LCS: The John Nelson house has many details at the cornice and doorway that are identical to the Asher Benjamin pattern book.	4	6	0	0
		Agricultural to 1951	NR: The history of the district is inextricably tied to agriculture, which was the primary activity carried on there throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.	3	7	3	6
Total				12	15	8	8
Allowed Impact: Subtotal out of 36 and 24 possible points respectively				27	16		

**MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Significance and Integrity Matrix**

Site	Date of Extant Structure	Significance Category	Site Significance	Structure Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Structure Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)
John Nelson Barn	ca. 1810	Military 1775	NR: Minute Man National Historical Park derives its primary significance as the site of the Battle of Lexington and Concord that marked the beginning of the American Revolutionary War. LCS: Locally significant as part of Nelson family ties to the area.	0	0	5	2
		Architectural	NR: Architecturally, the district embodies a collection of dwellings that are representative of local building trends from the early eighteenth century through the mid twentieth century. LCS: The John Nelson barn retains high architectural integrity.	3	6	0	0
		Agricultural to 1951	NR: The history of the district is inextricably tied to agriculture, which was the primary economic activity there throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. LCS: The John Nelson barn exemplifies agrarian tradition of the area.	3	7	3	6
Total				6	13	8	8
Allowed Impact: Subtotal out of 36 and 24 possible points respectively				19	16		

**MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Significance and Integrity Matrix**

Site	Date of Extant Structure	Significance Category	Site Significance	Structure Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Structure Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)
Rogers Barn	ca. 1880 / 1938	Military 1775	NR: Minute Man National Historical Park derives its primary significance as the site of the Battle of Lexington and Concord that marked the beginning of the American Revolutionary War.	0	0	5	3
		Architectural	NR: Architecturally, the district embodies a collection of dwellings that are representative of local building trends from the early eighteenth century through the mid twentieth century.	3	6	0	0
		Agricultural to 1951	NR: The history of the district is inextricably tied to agriculture, which was the primary economic activity carried on there throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The Rogers barn is located on the North Great Road in an area that remained in agricultural land use though the nineteenth century.	4	7	4	7
Total				7	13	9	10
Allowed Impact: Subtotal out of 36 and 24 possible points respectively				20	19		

**MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Significance and Integrity Matrix**

Site	Date of Extant Structure	Significance Category	Site Significance	Structure Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Structure Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)
Olive Stow House	ca. 1786	Military 1775	NR: Minute Man National Historical Park derives its primary significance as the site of the Battle of Lexington and Concord that marked the beginning of the American Revolutionary War.	0	0	5	2
		Architectural	NR: Architecturally, the district embodies a collection of dwellings that are representative of local building trends from the early eighteenth century through the mid twentieth century. The Olive Stow house retains a high degree of its post-Colonial period integrity. (NR has wrong construction date of ca. 1760 and mentions the house as "Colonial-period.")	4	6	0	0
		Agricultural to 1951	NR: The history of the district is inextricably tied to agriculture, which was the primary economic activity carried on there throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. LCS: The Stow farm was part of the agricultural scene in 1775.	3	6	3	4
Total				7	12	8	6
Allowed Impact: Subtotal out of 36 and 24 possible points respectively				19		14	

**MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Significance and Integrity Matrix**

Site	Date of Extant Structure	Significance Category	Site Significance	Structure Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Structure Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)
Olive Stow Garage / Hovagimian Barn	ca. 1945	Military 1775	NR: Minute Man National Historical Park derives its primary significance as the site of the Battle of Lexington and Concord that marked the beginning of the American Revolutionary War.	0	0	5	2
		Architectural	NR: Architecturally, the district embodies a collection of dwellings that are representative of local building trends from the early eighteenth century through the mid twentieth century.	3	6	0	0
		Agricultural to 1951	NR: The history of the district is inextricably tied to agriculture, which was the primary economic activity carried on there throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.	3	6	3	4
Total				6	12	8	6
Allowed Impact: Subtotal out of 36 and 24 possible points respectively				18	14		

**MIMA Battle Road Structure Survey
Significance and Integrity Matrix**

Site	Date of Extant Structure	Significance Category	Site Significance	Structure Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Structure Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Significance Rating (0 - 5, Lowest to Highest)	Landscape Integrity Rating (0 - 7, Lowest to Highest)
George Minot House/Perry House	ca. 1865	Military 1775	NR: Minute Man National Historical Park derives its primary significance as the site of the Battle of Lexington and Concord that marked the beginning of the American Revolutionary War.	0	0	5	2
		Architectural	NR: Architecturally, the district embodies a collection of dwellings that are representative of local building trends from the early eighteenth century through the mid twentieth century.	3	6	0	0
		Agricultural to 1951	NR: The history of the district is inextricably tied to agriculture, which was the primary economic activity carried on there throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.	0	4	3	5
Total				3	10	8	7
Allowed Impact: Subtotal out of 36 and 24 possible points respectively				13	15		

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

Department of Interior. National Park Service. Director's Order 28: Cultural Resource Management Guideline. 1998.

Harrington, Mary Kate, Emily Paulus, Duncan Ritchie, Stephen Olausen. National Register Nomination, Minuteman National Historical Park. November 2002.